

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Group VI, claim 47, drawn to a method for biomolecular screening.

Applicants elect Group II, claims 10-19, with traverse. It is Applicants' opinion that the entire claims represent unitary subject matter. In particular, it is noted that the Examiner has also made the admission that Group II and Group IV are closely related and dependent on one another. For example, claims 28-37 are drawn to a compound prepared according to the method of claim 10. Applicants especially request reconsideration to join Group IV, claims 28-37.

In addition to the restriction requirement, the Patent Office has also required an election of species. In the Office Action at page 6 and the top of page 7, the Office notes that with the election of Group II, an election is required among three subgroups:

Subgroup A, Applicants elect the building block units of claim 13, specifically, these are illustrated in Examples 1-3.

Subgroup B concerns a species of linkage, Applicants respectfully elects claim 12 to amides.

Subgroup C concerns a species of template molecule, Applicants elect a solid substrate as a template, as in claim 17.

The species elected are also made with traverse and it is respectfully requested that on allowance of the individual species within Group II, that all of the claims within Group II be examined together and allowed in one application.


Should there be any additional outstanding questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In view of the above, prosecution on the merits of the elected claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

11/8/02  
Date

  
Ronald A. Daignault  
Reg. No. 25,968  
Merchant & Gould P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

RAD:kf